## Application No. Applicant(s)

Interview Summary	09/202,047	ITOH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Larry R. Helms	1642	
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):			
) <u>Larry R. Helms</u> .	(3) <u>Anthony Caputa</u> .		

(4)\_\_\_\_

Date of Ir	nterview: 22 October 2002.	
Type: a	ı)  Telephonic b)  Video Conference c)  Personal [copy given to: 1)  applicant	2) applicant's representative]
	own or demonstration conducted: d) Yes brief description:	e) No.
Claim(s) discussed: <u>claims 6, 7,8</u> .		
Identification of prior art discussed: Nakao et al .		

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed amendments to te claims to obviate art and written description rejections .

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an

Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

(2) Ms Rupert.